



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,092	05/10/2007	Paul Oreste Gioia	60838.000610	4356
21967	7590	05/12/2010	EXAMINER	
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP			SOROUSH, ALI	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1900 K STREET, N.W.				1616
SUITE 1200				
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/12/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/588,092	Applicant(s) GIOIA, PAUL ORESTE
	Examiner ALI SOROUSH	Art Unit 1616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2010.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 15,16 and 18-30 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 15,16 and 18-30 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgement of Receipt

Applicant's response filed on 02/01/2010 to the Office Action mailed on 07/30/2009 is acknowledged.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-14 and 17 are cancelled. Therefore, claims 15, 16, and 18-30 are currently pending examination for patentability.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Applicant Claims
2. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
3. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue; and resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

1. The rejection of claims 15, 16, and 18-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aven (European Patent Application EP 1025757 A1, Published 08/09/2000) in view of Hei et al. (US Patent 6593283 B2, Published 07/15/2003) as

evidenced by Sealed Air (MSDS Instapak Port Cleaner, Rev. 006, 03/1005) is maintained.

Applicant Claims

Applicant claims an emulsifiable concentrate comprising an active ingredient being a dinitroaniline compound, emulsifier or emulsifier mixture, a solvent, and a cosolvent having the following formula $R_1O-CO-(CH_2)_n-CO-OR_2$.

Determination of the Scope and Content of the Prior Art (MPEP §2141.01)

Aven teaches "Crop protection emulsifiable concentrate containing defoaming agents" (See title). "Emulsifiable concentrate (EC) formulations conventionally contain an active ingredient, one or more surfactants which act as emulsifiers upon dilution of the EC with water, and a water immiscible solvent. Typical solvents for conventional EC formulations are aromatic hydrocarbons such as xylene, Shellsol A or Solvesso 200." (See page 2, paragraph 0001). "The relative amount of solid active ingredient soluble in EC increases by about 40 to 60% when 10 to 15% cosolvent is incorporated into the formulation." (See page 8, paragraph 0062). "It has surprisingly been found that the stable EC formulations containing at least one pesticidal crop protection active compound, at least one non polar organic solvent, optionally one polar aprotic cosolvent, an emulsifiable surfactant system, and at least one defoaming and foam breaking agent ... show clearly reduced foaming behavior upon dilution with water." (See page 3, paragraph 0015). "Preferably, the pesticide is selected from the group consisting of herbicides, insecticides, fungicides, bactericides, nematicides, algicides,

molluscicides, viricides, compounds inducing resistance into plants, biological control agents such as viruses, bacteria, nematodes, fungi and other microorganisms, repellents of birds and animals, and plant growth regulators, or mixtures thereof." (See page 3, paragraph 0018). "Preferred herbicides are the compounds selected from the group consisting of: pendimethalin and trifluralin". (See page 4, paragraphs 0027 and 0028). "The suitable organic solvents in which the pesticide is dissolved are, as a rule, water-immiscible solvents. They are preferably selected from the group consisting of aromatic hydrocarbons, aliphatic hydrocarbons, carboxylic acid esters, alcohols, dialkylene glycol mono- or dialkyl ethers and esters of plant oils or mixtures thereof" (See page 5, paragraph 0034). "The water-miscible aprotic solvents used as cosolvents are useful to increase the amount of active ingredient and adjuvant in the EC." (See page 3, paragraph 0038). "In another preferred embodiment of the invention the co-solvent consists essentially of one or more, preferably two or three dimethyl dicarboxylates of formula $H_3CO-CO-(CH_2)_n-CO-OCH_3$ wherein n is 2, 3, or 4. A particularly preferred cosolvent is a mixture consisting of glutaric acid dimethyl ester, succinic acid dimethyl ester, and adipic acid dimethyl ester, most preferred DBE ..." (See page 3, paragraph 0039 and 0040). "The emulsifying surfactant system enabling the EC to form an oil-in-water emulsion when the formulation is added to water is a mixture of two or more surfactants, at least one of which is an anionic surfactant (a) and at least one of which is a nonionic surfactant (b). (See page 5, paragraph 0041). "Most preferred anionic surfactants are the sodium, calcium or triethyl ammonium salts of dodecyl benzene sulfonic acid ..." (See page 6, paragraph 0042). "Examples of non-

ionic surfactants are nonylphenol polyethoxy ethanols, castor oil polyglycol ethers, polyadducts of ethylene oxide and propylene oxide, tributyl phenoxy polyethoxy ethanol, octyl phenoxy polyethoxy ethanol and tristyrylphenol ethoxylates ... Preferred are ethoxylated fatty acids such as castor or canola oil ethoxylates ... such as ... UKanil®2507(castor oil ethoxylate) ..." (See page 6, paragraphs 0043 and 0044). "Preferred embodiments of the invention are as follows: (i) An EC containing – 10 to 900 g/L, in particular, 100 to 850 g/L of at least one pesticidal crop protection active compound, - 50 to 800 g/L, in particular, 100 to 300 g/L of at least one non-polar organic solvent, -0 to 400 g/L, in particular, 0 to 250 g/L of at least one polar aprotic cosolvent, - 20 to 500 g/L, in particular, 40 to 450 g/L of the emulsifying surfactant system, and -0.1 to 20 g/L, in particular 0.2 to 10 g/L of at least one defoaming or foam breaking agent ..." (See page 7, paragraph 0058). In preferred example an EC formulation is prepared containing: 240 g/L Pendimethalin, 50 g/L Phenylsulfonat CA100, 50 g/L Ukanil 2507, 264 g/L Syneronic 91-6, 198 g/L DBE, 1 g/L Fluowet PP, and to 1L Agsol EX12. (See page 14, example 10). Phenylsulfant CA 100 is a mixture of calcium salt of branched dodecyl benzene sulfonate, Genopol X-060, and Solvesso 200. (See page 9, paragraph 0069).

***Ascertainment of the Difference Between Scope the Prior Art and the Claims
(MPEP §2141.012)***

Aven does not teach the co-solvent being a diisobutyl adipate or a mixture of diisobutyl adipate, diisobutyl glutarate, and diisobutyl succinate. This deficiency is cured by the teachings of Hei et al.

Hei et al. teaches an antimicrobial composition comprising a diluting solvent (water), an antimicrobially-active solvent, an optional cosolvent, surfactant, or additional antimicrobial surfactant. (See abstract). The preferred solvents include dibasic esters such as DBE and DBE-IB. (See column 7, Lines 1-27). The composition is suitable for application to growing or harvested plant material including leaves, stems, tubers, roots, seeds, and the like. (See column 12, Lines 13-15).

Sealed Air teaches that DBE-IB is composition comprising 55-70% Diisobutyl glutarate, 20-30% Diisobutyl succinate, and 10-20% Diisobutyl adipate. (See page 1, Section 2).

***Finding of Prima Facie Obviousness Rational and Motivation
(MPEP §2142-2143)***

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Aven with Hei et al. One would have been motivated to do so because Hei et al. teaches that a composition useful for plant protection wherein the solvents DBE and DBE-IB are suitable alternatives for each other. Therefore, the instant emulsifiable concentrate would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention.

Response to Applicant's Arguments

Applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine the teachings of Aven with Hei et al. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but found not to be persuasive. It is the Examiners position that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute DBE with DBE-IB in the composition of Aven. One

would have been motivated to do so because Hei et al. teach that DBE and DBE-IB are suitable alternative co-solvents useful in formulations for application to plants and crops. One would have been motivated to select DBE-IB from the list of co-solvents taught by Hei et al. through routine optimization because Aven teaches it is the water-miscible aprotic solvents that are useful in increasing the amount of active ingredient and adjuvant in the emulsifiable concentrate. Therefore, in order to maximize the amount of active ingredient in the emulsifiable concentrate one of ordinary skill in the art would try all the water-miscible aprotic co-solvents in the finite list taught by Hei et al.

Applicant further argues that it would not have been obvious to arrive at active ingredient concentration of at least 400g/L from the teachings of Aven. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but found not to be persuasive. It is the Examiners position that it would have been obvious to arrive at the instantly claimed concentration through routine optimization since Aven teach that the concentration of the active ingredient between 100 to 850 g/L. Therefore, the rejection of claims 15, 16, and 18-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is maintained.

Declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.132

Applicant argues that instant invention is not obvious over the prior art because Applicant has discovered an unexpected result when using DBE-IB instead of DBE as a co-solvent. Applicant Declaration has been fully considered but found not to be persuasive. Applicant's comparison is not commensurate in scope with the instant claims. Instant claim 15, for example, is directed to greater than 400g/L of a dinatroaniline compound, emulsifier or emulsifiers mixtures, a solvent, and DBE-IB with

no concentrations. In the Declaration Applicant has only shown one composition of specific emulsifiers, solvents, and active ingredient having specific concentrations. Therefore, the limited composition described in the Declaration is not commensurate in scope with the broad instant claim.

Furthermore, Applicant's results of unexpected data are not supported by Applicant's specification. Applicant's specification has no disclosure as to emulsion quality. Even assuming arguendo that this was the case, Applicant provides data that is a difference in degree, not a difference in kind. Applicant's data that the prior art formulation has degraded emulsion quality after 1 week at -5°C and that the instant formulation has good emulsion quality under the same conditions is a relative assessment and therefore not persuasive. For the foregoing reasons, the Declaration of Paul Gioia is found not to be persuasive.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ali Soroush whose telephone number is (571) 272-9925. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8:30am to 5:00pm E.S.T.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on (571) 272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ali Soroush
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 1616

/Johann R. Richter/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1616